

Remarks/Arguments

In the Office Action, dated March 24, 2003, the examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure for several specified reasons. A substitute Abstract is enclosed herewith on a separate sheet, which applicant believes will obviate the examiner's objections.

The examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for particular phrasing that the examiner believes are grammatically incorrect and confusing. The examiner also rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Eberhardt et al. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eberhardt et al., in view of Stocker, and claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eberhardt et al., in view of Gianchandani. However, the examiner also stated that claims 1-3, 8, and 9 would be allowable if re-written or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action.

In response, the applicant has amended claims 1-3, 8, and 9 in a manner that applicant believes will obviate the examiner's reasons for the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections. In this regard, claim 1 is believed to be written in a classic *Jepson* format, as taught in R. Faber, Landis on Mechanics of Patent Claim Drafting, Practising Law Institute, 4th Ed., 1998 § 57, p. VI-27, a copy of which is enclosed. The amendments made to claims 1-3, 8, and 9 are intended to meet the examiner's concerns and to conform the recitation even closer to the *Jepson* format, and not to change the scope of these claims in any way. If the examiner has any further concerns on suggestions regarding the clarity or definitiveness of these claims, he is invited to call the applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The applicant does not agree with the examiner's rejection of claims 4 and 5 as being anticipated by Eberhardt et al. For example, the differential pressure sensor 34 in Eberhardt et al., does not have a side exposed to ambient atmospheric pressure, and there are no door controls or door control signals in Eberhardt et al. However, upon review of those claims 4-7, they appear to be somewhat redundant in relation to claims 1-3, so claims 4-7 are being cancelled.

CONCLUSION

All of the remaining pending claims 1-3, 8, and 9, as amended, are believed to be allowable for the reasons explained above. Therefore, the examiner is requested to withdraw his rejections of those claims and to grant an early allowance. If any issues remain to be resolved, the examiner is requested to contact applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

By: 

James R. Young

Reg. No. 27,847

Tel.: (303) 546-1371

(Effective September 26, 2003)

Tel.: (303) 447-7771